

Appln. No.: 10/011,545
Amendment Dated May 31, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2005

MATP-606US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-10 are pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10. In particular, Zhou does not disclose or suggest that "the display of frames from the first GOP begins prior to the decoding of any frame from the second GOP" as set forth in amended claim 1. Amended claims 4, 6, 8 and 10 include similar limitations. Basis for this amendment may be found in Fig. 3 and paragraph [0035].

Zhou requires that at least one I frame from the next group of pictures be decoded before the first reverse-time sequence frame in the first group of pictures (i.e. frame 12) can be displayed. (See col. 6, line 62 through col. 7, line 12). The frame from the second GOP in reverse time sequence is referred to as the "transitive frame." (See col. 7, lines 7-9). Furthermore, Zhou states that "[t]he advancement of decompressing a transitive frame is one of the important features of the disclosed system." Thus, it can not be obvious to modify Zhou to allow display of frames from the current GOP to begin before the transitive frame has been decoded because to do so would be to eliminate a feature of the invention that Zhou considers to be important.

This feature provides the subject invention with an advantage over the system disclosed by Zhou because the system of the present invention may begin displaying the images more quickly, as it does not need to decode the transitive frame before starting to display frames from the first group of pictures.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Zhou. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the statement in the Office Action that claims 2, 5, 7 and 9 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims but would be allowable if amended to include all of the limitations of their base claims. None of these claims has an intervening claim. Claims 2 and 7 have been so amended and, as such, are in condition for


Appln. No.: 10/011,545
Amendment Dated May 31, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2005

MATP-606US

allowance. Claims 5 and 9 depend from claims 4 and 8, respectively, and are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Zhou for at least the same reasons as claims 4 and 8.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10 and the objections to claims 2, 5, 7 and 9.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicant


Dated: May 31, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (703)872-9306 on:

May 31, 2005



Tonya M. Berger